

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2007. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 1-10 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10 are being amended.

All amendments to the application are fully supported therein, including page 14, lines 11-14 of the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

First 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Each of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kataoka (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0056462) in view of Yamamoto Shoichi (JP 09-097203) (hereinafter "Yamamoto"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1

In a method as recited in claim 1, a job execution request issued by a client machine to a server machine is accompanied by environment information on the client machine side and job execution statements. The environment information includes a volume logical path, a volume physical path on the client machine side, a program product name, and a version of the program product on the client machine side. Upon receiving the job execution request, the server machine assigns a sever side volume corresponding to a client side volume and transfers input data on the client side volume to the server side volume. Also, the server machine converts the environment information and the job execution statements so as to replace information about the volume logical path and the volume physical path with corresponding information for the server machine, and further replace the program product name and the version with corresponding information for the server machine on an as-needed

basis. After the transfer of the input data and the conversion of the job execution statements and the environment information, the server machine executes the requested job.

In contrast, as admitted by the Examiner, Kataoka does not show or suggest that the environment information includes a volume logical path and a volume physical path on the client machine side and the server machine is allowed to control assignment of a server side volume corresponding to a client side volume and transfer of input data on the client side volume to a server side volume, to convert the environment information and the job execution statements so as to replace information about the volume logical path and the volume physical path with corresponding information for the server machine, and to execute the job.

Also, Kataoka does not show or suggest that the environment information includes a program product name, and a version of the program product on the client machine side and the server machine is allowed to convert the environment information and the job execution statements so as to further replace the program product name and the version with corresponding information for the server machine on an as-needed basis.

The secondary reference of Yamamoto is directed to a distributed processing system which allows description of the program by the logical file name unified systematically (paragraph [0015]). In Yamamoto, the distributed processing system has a job management server which manages the whole distributed processing of a program and a plurality of job activation servers which perform job, namely, a series of processing of a program. The job management server inputs a logic job description described in accordance with a unified logical file system, and issues an execution order to a relevant job activation server (paragraphs [0016], [0027], Fig. 2). Upon receiving this order, the job activation server executes job after reading and changing the logical name file in the program into a file on each physical device of the job activation server (paragraphs [0019], [0028], Fig. 2).

However, Yamamoto says nothing about environment information on the client machine side including a volume logical path, a volume physical path on the client machine side, a program product name, and a version of the program product on the client machine side, as recited in claim 1. Although Yamamoto shows a unified logical file system applicable over the whole of the job activation servers, Yamamoto's system lacks the environment information of the individual client machine, more particularly, a volume logical path and a volume physical path on the client machine side. Therefore Yamamoto cannot show or suggest assigning a server side volume corresponding to a client side volume as

recited in claim 1. Also, Yamamoto cannot and does not show or suggest conversion of the environment information so as to replace information about the volume logical path and the volume physical path by corresponding information for the server machine, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, translation from a logical name file to a file on a physical device shown in Yamamoto should be considered translation from a logical resource name to the physical resource name. It cannot be considered conversion of environment information on the client machine side so as to replace information about the volume logical path and the volume physical path with corresponding information for the server machine, and further replace the program product name and the version with corresponding information for the server machine on an as-needed basis.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would and could not achieve all the features as recited in claim 1 by combining Yamamoto with Kataoka. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious in view of all the prior art cited.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 have substantially the same features as those of claim 1, at least with respect to environment information including a volume logical path, a volume physical path on the client machine side, a program product name, and a version of the program product on the client machine side and allowing the server machine to control assignment of a server side volume corresponding to a client side volume and transfer of input data on the client side volume to a server side volume, to convert the environment information and the job execution statements so as to replace information about the volume logical path and the volume physical path by corresponding information for the server machine, and further replace the program product name and the version by corresponding information for the server machine on an as-needed basis, and to execute the job.

As such, the arguments set forth above are equally applicable here. Claim 1 being allowable, claims 3 and 8 must also be allowable.

Claims 5, 6, 10

As to dependent claims 5, 6, and 10, the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 3, 8 are equally applicable here. The corresponding base claim being allowable, claims 5, 6, and 10 must also be allowable.

Second 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Each of claims 4 and 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kataoka in view of Yamamoto and further in view of Loomans (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,605). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

As set forth above, the combination of Kataoka and Yamamoto fails to teach all the elements recited in claims 3 and 8, from which claims 4 and 9 depend, respectively. The secondary reference of Loomans fails to provide any disclosure, teaching or suggestion that makes up for the deficiencies in the combination of Kataoka and Yamamoto. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would not and could not achieve all the features as recited in claims 3 and 8, from which claims 4 and 9 depend. Accordingly, claims 4 and 9 are not obvious in view of all the prior art cited.

Conclusion

In light of the Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action with regard to the present application, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344


Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200
February 15, 2008
SPF/JCM/YO